DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 208 UD 020 490

AUTHOR Greenbaum, Lenora
TITLE American Inequality: A Statistical Comparison of Relative Social Standing Among White Ethnic and Racial Minority Groups.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 43p.; Not available in paper copy due to author's restriction.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Attainment; Employment Level; *Ethnic Groups; Income; *Minority Groups; Public Policy; *Social Status; *Socioeconomic Status; *Whites

ABSTRACT

In this paper, fourteen white ethnic groups and racial minorities are compared on the basis of a composite Social Standing Score derived from data on per capita income, male occupational prestige, and higher education achieved for each group in the United States. The groups selected include American Indian (including native Alaskan), Black, Mexican, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Puerto Rican, German, Italian, Irish, French, Polish, Russian, and English/Scottish/Welsh. The findings show a very wide spread in social standing among the groups, with American Indians, Blacks, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans ranked as the four lowest groups both on composite and individual indicators, and Russians, English/Scottish/Welsh, Japanese, and Chinese ranking the highest. The greatest variations among the groups occur in education. Occupational prestige levels show the least variation. Public policy implications of ethnic/racial status differences are discussed. The need for programs to promote upward mobility in education, occupational prestige, and income for the lowest groups is stressed. Also considered are possible explanations for differences in social standing among ethnic and minority groups. Data tables and a bibliography are attached. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 1 7 1980

ED185208

AMERICAN INEQUALITY:

A STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF RELATIVE SOCIAL STANDING AMONG WHITE ETHNIC AND RACIAL MINORITY GROUPS

BY

LENORA GREENBAUM

ADELPHI UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

REPRODUCTION OF THIS MATERIAL

OR EXTENDED QUOTATION FROM IT

ONLY WITH PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR.

UD C20490

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lenora Greenbaum

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AMERICAN INEQUALITY:

A STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF RELATIVE SOCIAL STANDING

AMONG WHITE ETHNIC AND RACIAL MINORITY GROUPS

INTRODUCTION

The present research into relative social standing of American sub-cultural groups has a two-fold purpose: first to add to our knowledge of group characteristics of ethnic and racial minority groups; and second, to provide data for evaluating public policy regarding specific minority groups.

In the field of social science, there has been a long history of research into race and ethnic relations. This literature, largely descriptive and theoretical, is so extensive, well-known and available as to defy any facile overview. Suffice to say that a recent work by Bahr, Chadwick and Strauss (1979) on ethnicity contains a bibliography of almost 50 pages and includes more than 1,200 entries. The reader is referred to this work for specific citations.

Work on stratification, social class and social standing has produced many important contributions, going back to the Lynds' MIDDLETOWN (1929) and the Warner studies (1945), plus subsequent investigations by Hollingshead and Redlich (1950), Blau and Duncan (1967), Jencks (1972), Hauser and Featherman (1977), Treiman (1977), Coleman and Rainwater (1978). Some authors (such as Hauser and Featherman, 1977) have developed methods of assessing levels of differential

status for individuals, while others (e.g., Warner 1945, Curtis and Jackson 1971) attempt to profile whole communities in terms of their stratified network.

Efforts at assessing specific racial and ethnic group status have tended to compare one or several racial minorities with the dominant "white" group and/or with each other (for example, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1976; Jiobu, 1976, among many others). Similar studies for individual white ethnic groups have been rare indeed. One can point to the relatively recent work of Abrahamson (1973), Greeley (1974), Sowell (1978) as examples of making some assessment of white ethnic group characteristics for individual groups and group comparisons.

The field of comparing a number of individual white ethnic groups and individual racial minorities with each other has been largely neglected in the past. Recent development of ethnic interest in the country, engendered in the past by the civil rights movement of the 1960's, plus the subsequent adoption of public policies granting special benefits to certain minorities (affirmative action in employment and education, special minority programs in housing, business, etc.) have raised questions regarding the relative positions of sub-cultural groups and the

basis for eligibility regarding these public policy measures.

The importance of this subject and yet the lack of relevant information and analyses were strong motivations for the current work. This paper is a beginning effort to present a picture of American sub-cultural groups along the continuum of social position in the United States to shed some needed light in this area.

METHOD

Group comparisons are made in this paper for fourteen sub-cultural groups: Seven white ethnic groups and seven racial minorities. These groups are compared with each other on the basis of a composite Social Standing Score. This Score (hereafter referred to as SSS) is derived from specific data on per capita income, occupational prestige and higher education achieved for each group.

The following definitions detail the method by which the basic information used in this study was derived and analyzed to provide the group comparisons discussed in the Findings section below.

Racial Minority Groups: The seven racial minority groups selected for study are American Indian/Alaskan Native, Black, Mexican-American, Japanese-American, Chinese-American, Pilipino-American and Puerto Rican. These are groups for whom detailed information on income, education and occupational prestige is available in the United States Commission on Civil Rights publication, Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women, August 1978.

White Ethnic Groups: The seven white ethnic groups selected for study are: German, Italian, Irish, French, Polish, Russian and English/Scottish/Welsh. Detailed information is available for these groups on income, education and occupation in the United States Census Bureau publication, CPR, P-20, #249, Characteristics of the Population by Ethnic Origin, March 1972 and March 1971.

Intra-Group Social Class Differences:

It must be noted that persons surveyed by the Census Bureau for the two publications referred to above were assigned to particular ethnic or racial groups based on their own self-report. These categories cross social class lines, and in each case include persons at all socio-economic levels. For example, the English/Scottish/Welsh group includes members of the most affluent segment of American society (bankers, corporation executives, etc.) as well as some of the poorest Americans in the hollows of Appalachia. This type of social class spread is true in varying degrees of all the groups studied here. No attempt is made in this paper to analyze the nature of these intra-group differences. For the sake of consistency and

because of the nature of the question addressed, groups are treated as a whole, and the SSS for any one group represents the composite picture of the characteristics of people who identify themselves with that particular group.

Religious Differences:

While religious influences are important in understanding ethnic and racial group differences, no effort was made to analyze the data in terms of religious composition of these groups. Some groups are largely Protestant, e.g., English/Scottish/Welsh, Black; some largely Catholic, e.g., Italian, Puerto Rican; one largely Jewish, the Russian. Other groups have mixed religious influences, e.g., German include Protestant, Catholic and Jewish; Irish include Protestant and Catholic; Polish include Catholic and Jewish. It is outside the scope of this paper to assess the religious composition of the groups relative to social standing nor to address the interaction of these characteristics.

Other Racial and Ethnic Groups: Groups for whom comparable data are not available have been omitted from consideration in this study. These groups include persons of mixed

ethnic/racial background, persons of other ethnic groups, such as Swedes, Koreans, East Indians, Greeks, etc., and persons not listing a racial/ethnic identification in the surveys taken. It is estimated that groups for whom data are not available in this study comprise about 40% of the United States population. (See Table 1)

Per Capita Income[2]: The income indicator used is median family or household income considered on a per capita basis. Per capita income is more refined than median total income because it takes into account the number of people in a family or household. particularly the number of non-income producing dependents who must be supported by the income of that household or family.

Higher Education[3]: The education indicator used is the proportion of young adults who completed four or more years of college. Several reasons dictated the use of these data. Completion of college or beyond is likely to be a more discriminating indicator than a lesser amount of education because of the greater difficulty of achieving it. Further, opportunity for higher education is a central aspect of affirmative action programs, and the relative status of racial and ethnic groups at

this level becomes important. Finally, it is an aspect of education data collection that is roughly comparable for racial minorities and white ethnics.

Male Occupational Prestige:[4] Male occupational prestige was used as the indicator of occupational level. The use of this indicator for males alone, rather than females alone or male plus female combined, was decided upon because family status tends to be more dependent on the occupation of the male than on that of the female. A further confounding factor is that not all groups have an equal proportion of women in the work force and a refinement would have to be made to adjust for this differential. Data however were not available to make this adjustment for the racial minorities. It was felt therefore that greater comparability among all groups could be achieved by limiting the occupational indicator to male occupational prestige scores.

Composite Social Standing Score: Using the three indicators (per capita income; higher education; and male occupational prestige) a composite Social Standing Score was developed. The formula for combining these components was adapted from the work of Coleman and Rainwater (1978). According

to these authors, weights for income, occupation and education were determined on the basis of judgments provided by random samples of the American population. Extensive interviewing was conducted to ascertain how the public assigns social standing based on income, occupation and education. The formula, which incorporates these judgments, is the following:

$$\text{Social Standing} = (\text{Income})^{.543} (\text{Occupation})^{.273} (\text{Education})^{.184}$$

To implement this formula, data collected in this study for income, education and occupational prestige, as defined above, were converted to index numbers, using the United States total as the standard (United States = 100). For each racial minority and white ethnic group, three separate index numbers were developed: one for income, one for education and one for occupational prestige. To arrive at the Social Standing Score for each group, its three separate indexes were used in the above formula.

FINDINGS

The findings show a very wide spread of social standing among these fourteen groups. The computed Social Standing Scores (SSS) range from a low of 52 to a high of 164 (United States = 100). (See Table 2)

The four groups at the lowest social standing levels (scores between 50 and 60) are: American Indian/ Alaskan Native, Black, Mexican-American and Puerto Rican. These groups are consistently low on all individual indicators as well as on the composite Score. They fall well below the United States average.

The four highest groups (scores between 120 and 164) are: the Russian, the English/Scottish/Welsh, the Japanese-American, and the Chinese-American.

These four groups achieved their high status by various routes. For the Chinese-Americans, it is largely their educational achievement that places them among the top four. The English/Scottish/Welsh and the Japanese-Americans are noticeably high on education and income. The Russians score high on all three indicators, education, occupation and income.

Of the White ethnic groups, only the French score somewhat below the national average indicators, while the Germans, Italians and Irish are above but relatively close to the national average.

Variation among ethnic and racial groups present other interesting findings. The greatest variation can be seen in regard to education (standard deviation = 101 index points). The four lowest groups have indexes from 24 to 48 points; the four highest on education alone from 176 to 352 points. The impact of this finding becomes clearer when we look at the actual percentages of young adults completing 4 or more years of college. (See Table 3) At the extremes, among the Puerto Ricans 4% achieved this higher education as of 1971, whereas the comparable percentage for the Chinese was close to 60%. This means that proportionately 15 times more young adults completed college among the Chinese than among the Puerto Ricans, a startling figure in terms of potential advantage in the American opportunity structure.

The other groups with very low proportions of higher education are the American Indians/Alaskan Natives, Blacks, and Mexican-American, all between 6% and 8%. Others

with high educational attainment are the Russians, over 50%; the Japanese-Americans, over 40%; the Pilipino-Americans and the English/Scottish/Welsh, over 20%. The remaining white ethnic groups are all fairly close to the United States figure of 16.5%, except for the French (only 10%).

Looking back at Table 1 again, we see that both income and occupational prestige vary much less than education (standard deviations of 31.5 index points and 13 index points respectively). On both indicators, the four lowest groups on the SSS remain consistently at the bottom. On the income indicator, the four highest are the Russian, Japanese-American, Polish and English/Scottish/Welsh. It should be noted that despite their high education attainment, the Chinese-American and the Pilipino-American fall somewhat below the national average in per capita income. The Polish on the other hand rank much higher on income than they do on education. (See Table 4)

Looking at the actual per capita income in 1971, (Table 5), we see that, at the median, the American Indians/Alaskan Native family had a little over $1,500 per person for that year. By comparison, both the Russian family and

the Japanese family had over $4,000 per person for that year, or more than 2½ times as much. These figures may well reflect even greater income disparities when we keep in mind that for the American Indian/Alaskan Native, half the families had less than $1,500 per person in 1971 and half the Russian and Japanese had over $4,000 per person. Despite income variations within each group, the range among the American Indian/Alaskan Native incomes compared with the range of the Russian or Japanese incomes (though not the subject of this paper) is likely to show great differences.

Per capita median incomes for Black, Mexican-American and Puerto Rican were all around $1,600, and together with the American Indian/Alaskan Native were the lowest of the fourteen groups. The high income groups, in addition to the Russians and the Japanese-Americans, were the Polish and the English/Scottish/Welsh, all over $3,500 per person. At the median, the high groups earned at least twice the income (per capita) of the low groups. At the extremes of the ranges, this figure could well be much higher.

It is important to note that both the Chinese-American and the Pilipino-American, despite their very high educational attainment, show median per capita incomes below the national average. The remaining white ethnic groups, except for the French, are all above the national average in median per capita income. Of these, the Polish rank among the four highest groups in income, much better than their education ranking (See Table 4).

Occupational prestige levels show the least variation among the fourteen groups (standard deviation = 13 index points) (See Table 1). The range of actual prestige scores (See Table 6) was from a low of 29.8 for the Black to a high of 48.2 for the Russian. Other low scoring groups include the American Indian/Alaskan Native, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican and the Pilipino-American. All other groups range at or slightly above the national average. On the basis of this data, occupational prestige does not seem to be as discriminating an indicator as income or education. Or putting it another way, the occupational positions in the United States may be more similar in prestige accorded them than in income awarded or education needed.

Despite the differences in ranges and variation, in terms of ranking of groups (See Table 4) we see great similarity in ranking of prestige and education on the one hand and prestige and income on the other. The Spearman rank-order correlation was found to be +.84 for income and prestige and +.83 for education and prestige, both very high positive correlations. Interestingly enough, the lowest correlation, +.70, was for income and education; this raises some interesting questions regarding the relationship of these two characteristics and will be dealt with in the next section.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

These findings contain some interesting insights into the workings of American society and have important implications for public policy.

The most consistent finding is that the American Indian/Alaskan Native, Black, Mexican-American and the Puerto Rican are the only groups at the lowest level of social standing both on the composite SSS and on each individual indicator. Whatever the circumstances of discrimination endured and the ability to cope with this discrimination, these groups seem to occupy a distinct stratum of "disadvantagedness." As a whole, they have very low per capita income, occupy the less prestigious jobs, and achieve least relative to completion of higher education. The effects of this in terms of self-perceptions, role modeling, negative stereotypes, and access to the "goods" of the society imply mammoth problems in a nation dedicated both to achievement in money, jobs and education and to equality for all. Problems created by such low social standing affect both the individual groups and the population as a whole.

The next important finding is that many white ethnic groups plus the Pilipino-American represent the "mainstream" of American society. On the composite SSS, these groups are closest to the national average and include the Germans, Irish, Italians, French, Polish, and Pilipino-American. On the individual indicators, these groups range close to the national average on at least two of the three or on all three. It is clear that whatever present or past discrimination these groups may have suffered, they do not experience overall "disadvantagement" to the degree experienced by the four lowest groups mentioned above. It would seem that arguments concerning why white ethnic groups are not included in special minority programs could be answered at least in part by their relatively favorable social standing as established here.

These "mainstream" groups however, being in the next best position on the ladder of social standing, may feel most threatended by advances by the lowest groups. Such advances could rearrange the social standing hierarchy to the detriment of the "mainstream" groups.

The position of the Oriental groups presents an interesting dilemma. Granted the history of previous discriminatory treatment of these racial minorities, public policies have included them as beneficiaries of special minority programs. The rationale for continuing this inclusion may need to be reconsidered, and based perhaps on factors other than their favorable social standing.

Looking at the findings by individual group provides some questions about the interpretation of discrimination as it impinges on group well-being.

For the four lowest groups, the fact of low social standing would seem to establish continuing effects of harsh past and present treatment and a lack of methods for counteracting these effects. The need for social policies to effect improvements in all three areas (income, occupation and education) seems clearly indicated.

The white ethnic "mainstream" groups for the most part seem to do better on income and on occupational prestige than they do on educational achievement. Can this be interpreted to mean the development of coping mechanism to succeed despite educational lacks? Does it mean that higher education is not as critical a need for financial accomplishment as may have been thought? Is there any need for special efforts to encourage greater educational achievement among groups whose standing on the income indicator is better than their educational standing? Will these groups lose ground in their overall social standing if higher education becomes increasingly necessary to occupational success? These are some of the questions raised by the findings on the "mainstream" groups. Answers to these questions may have important implications for social policy, particularly regarding educational encouragement.

Looking at the interactive effects of income, occupational prestige and higher education presents some provocative ideas. Based on the formula used, the variation in SSS is explained largely by the variation in income (the exponent for income being

much higher than for either of the other two factors). Where SSS for any group differs greatly from income level, this difference is usually the result of the education level. This effect (See Tables 2 & 4) can be clearly seen in regard to the Chinese-American or the French. It is further interesting to note the extreme variations in education level itself (standard deviation of 101 index points). The relatively low correlation (+.70) between income and education implies some disjunction between these two factors. Many people may be overqualified for the jobs they hold in terms of income received. According to our data, this may be true among the Orientals and the Russians. Other groups seem to be doing better in income than their educational level would imply, for example the Hispanics or the French. Are there general upper and lower income limits that do not respond to extremes of educational achievement? Also, what factors have caused groups to vary so widely in terms of education? These are questions that need further explanation.

The relatively low variability of occupational prestige (standard deviation = 13 index points) may be an indicator of occupational homogenization in the

United States. With the trend toward fewer and fewer unskilled and laborer jobs (in both urban and farm areas) and the use of a managerial group rather than owners of corporations, occupations are tending toward greater similarity. Income differences (standard deviation = 31.5 index points) remain much larger than prestige differences, though both are highly positively correlated (+.84). This means that similar types of occupations are differentially rewarded, and income while varying in the same direction as occupational prestige covers a wider range than prestige does. More detailed analysis of each group to determine which occupations they hold and at which income levels would add to a depth of understanding of these indicators.

POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS OF RELATIVE SOCIAL STANDING

Although this paper does not address causal factors of high or low social standing, yet some consideration must be given to possible influences on the relative positions of these groups.

Information gathered by Sowell (1978), in the book he edited, AMERICAN ETHNIC GROUPS, points to factors that have been offered in the past as possible explanations of high or low group social standing. The present paper corroborates the conclusion of that book that few of these explanations seem cogent.

The following are some explanations that seem to have questionable relevance: length of time in the United States; knowledge of the English language; previous condition of servitude; voluntary migration to the United States; visible physical differences; different ritual practice; strong family ties.

Looking at each item in terms of the Social Standing Scores of the fourteen white ethnic and racial minority groups, we see an inconsistent picture in every case.

(1) Groups longest in the United States include the American Indian/Alaskan Native, Black, and English/Scottish/Welsh, who were among the earliest groups and the Irish who arrived in the early 19th Century. The first two groups are among the lowest, the third among the highest and the fourth close to the national average. Groups arriving later also cover the range of social standing.

(2) Knowledge of the English language

The English/Scottish/Welsh and the Irish arrived with a knowledge of English. The Blacks have been in the country so long as to have been English speaking for centuries by now. By contrast all the other groups arrived with serious language barriers. Yet among the "original" English speakers as well as among the more recent arrivals without a knowledge of English the range of social standing covers the gamut from very high to very low.

(3) Previous condition of servitude

Although this has often been proffered as the explanation for the depressed condition of the Blacks in this country, Sowell (op. cit.) points to the West Indian Blacks in the United States who suffered as much under Caribbean slavery as American Blacks, and who nevertheless outrank American Blacks in accomplishment here. Petersen (1978:69) further indicates that in the 19th Century, Chinese were virtually enslaved when coming to the United States. He quotes President Grant as stating in 1874, "The great proportion of the Chinese immigrants who come to our shores do not come voluntarily...but come under contracts with headmen who own them almost absolutely."

(4) Voluntary migration to the United States

Following the information in item 3 above, we find that most other groups migrated on a voluntary basis, including the European white ethnics, the Puerto Ricans, and many Mexican-Americans. On the basis of both previous condition of servitude and voluntary migration to the United States, groups range from lowest to highest on social standing.

(5) Visible physical differences

Among the racial minorities, all have visible physical differences from the largely European stock white population. Yet again the range of social standing among these minorities is very wide.

(6) Different ritual practices[5]

Each sub-cultural group arrived with their own ritualistic and cultural practices, and have retained differential amounts in their adjustment to their new surroundings. Perhaps the greatest differences are to be found among the Orientals (Petersen, op. cit.) and among the Russians, the greatest majority of whom are Jews (Kessler-Harris and Yans-McLaughlin, 1978). Yet these groups are among the highest in social standing.

(7) Strong family ties

This characteristic is sometimes seen as a barrier to improving social standing (Goode, 1963) and sometimes as a benefit (Kessler-Harris and Yans-McLaughlin, op. cit.: 125-129). Strong family ties have been clearly evident among many immigrant groups, e.g., Italians, Russian (Jewish), Oriental, Puerto Rican, to name a few. Again these groups cover the range of social standing.

The above seven characteristics do not seem in and of themselves to be detriments of group social position. On the other hand, two other possible explanations seem particularly interesting and least contradictory in their application. Petersen, Kessler-Harris and Yans-McLaughlin, and Sowell (all op. cit.) each point to the advantages of urban skills and a heritage of experience in utilizing these skills. Hence Petersen indicates this for the Chinese and Japanese; Kessler-Harris et al for the English/Scottish/Welsh, the Russians and much less so for some other white ethnics; and Sowell for the West Indian Blacks and the Blacks descended from the "free people of color" before the Emancipation Proclamation. In regard to the Blacks as a group, those lacking these skills far outnumbered those who possessed them, interfering seriously with upward mobility. An additional factor for the Black population, according to Sowell, was that with emancipation, huge numbers of people flooded the job market; and the resulting backlash closed opportunities even to those ex-slaves who were skilled. It must be noted that the four highest

groups (in terms of SSS) all possessed a high degree of skills and practical previous experience useful for the American urban economic structure.

Another factor mentioned by the authors was the availability of financial credit. This availability is regarded as much more important than the amount of capital any group brought to this country.

Hence the mainstream commercial banks were available to the English/Scottish/Welsh, while intra-group organizations were formed among the Chinese, Japanese, and Russians to provide financial communal and self-help to their own people. Groups lacking such access to capital funds found their upward mobility seriously limited.

This brief overview of possible explanations of group social standing is meant to provide some general insights, and not designed as a definitive examination of the question. Much more research in needed to gain a clear understanding of why groups occupy their particular positions vis-a-vis each other.

FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper is a beginning effort into an understanding of relative social standing among American white ethnic and racial minority groups. Much research remains to be done.

The data in this paper are for the year 1971. It is important to know what changes have occurred since that time. What effects if any have resulted from recent migrations of Orientals and Russians? How have affirmative action programs influenced relative standing? What has the economic recession done to the arrangement of groups in the country? Perhaps the 1980 Census will provide data to help answer these questions.

In other specific areas, the following are questions that need some answers: What are the differences in relative position of women vis-a-vis men in these sub-cultural groups? What trends are evident, perhaps resulting from the women's movement of the 1970's? With fallen birth rates, is per capita income improving, and for which groups?

Are groups becoming more similar in educational attainment or are the great differences continuing? Are differences in occupational prestige continuing to be low or is some change discernible.

Finally, given the availability of this information, will the goverment seek the data as a basis for public policy decisions and as a method of evaluating the effectiveness of public policies undertaken?

These are some of the many questions that need attention in this relatively new and important area of social research.

TABLE 1

POPULATION DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED WHITE ETHNIC GROUPS AND RACIAL MINORITIES IN THE UNITED STATES - 1970-1971

GROUP	NUMBER * (IN MILLIONS)	PERCENT OF TOTAL
United States total (1970)	203.2	100.0
ETHNIC GROUPS (1971)		
English/Scottish/Welsh	31.0	15.3
German	25.7	12.7
Irish	16.3	8.0
Italian	8.7	4.3
French	5.2	2.6
Polish	4.9	2.4
Russian	2.1	1.0
RACIAL MINORITIES (1970)*		
Black	23.0	11.3
Mexican-American	4.5	2.2
Puerto Rican	1.5	.7
American Indian/Alaskan Native	.79	.4
Japanese-American	.59	.3
Chinese-American	.44	.2
Pilipino	.34	.2
All other***	78.14	38.5

* The count is projected from figures based solely on self-reporting by the sample population. This count does not necessarily coincide with data based on foreign percentage, place of birth, native mother tongue, or other indicators of ethnic identification.

** While the undercount of minorities in the 1970 Census is recognized, no effort was made to adjust the 1970 figures.

*** Includes persons of mixed ethnic/racial backgrounds, those of other ethnic groups such as Swedes, East Indians, Danes, Koreans, etc., and those not listing an ethnic or racial identification in the surveys taken.

N.B. Data for ethnic groups are for 1971; for racial minorities for 1970. These are the closest comparable data available. No separate category is listed for "Jewish" because Census figures are not collected according to religious affiliation. The category "Russian" is largely Jewish. Groups with a sizable minority of Jews are the "Polish" and "German"

TABLE 2

COMPOSITE SOCIAL STANDING SCORE BASED ON
INDEX NUMBERS FOR INCOME, OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE AND HIGHER EDUCATION INDICATORS

GROUP	COMPOSITE SOCIAL STANDING SCORE	INDEX NUMBERS FOR PER CAPITA INCOME	INDEX NUMBERS FOR MALE OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE	INDEX NUMBERS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ACHIEVED
United States total	100	100	100	100
ETHNIC GROUPS				
German	109	109	102	120
Italian	108	116	100	97
Irish	103	107	101	94
French	91	99	100	60
Polish	113	121	106	102
Russian	164	152	124	313
English/Scottish/Welsh	121	120	107	146
RACIAL MINORITIES				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	58	53	80	48
Black	57	55	77	42
Mexican-American	55	54	77	36
Japanese-American	143	140	102	248
Chinese-American	128	99	108	352
Pilipino-American	104	94	88	176
Puerto Rican	52	55	81	24
MEAN	100	98	97	133
STANDARD DEVIATION	33	31.5	13	101

Formula for computing Composite Social Standing Score:

$$SSS = (I^{.543}) \quad (O^{.273}) \quad (E^{.184})$$

(Income) (Occupational Prestige) (Education)

TABLE 3

HIGHER EDUCATION ACHIEVED
1971

GROUP	% OF POPULATION COMPLETING 4 OR MORE YEARS OF COLLEGE*	INDEX NUMBER UNITED STATES TOTAL = 100	RANKING OF INDEX NUMBER
	% of adults 25 to 35 years of age		
United States total	16.5	100	
ETHNIC GROUPS			
German	19.8	120	6
Italian	16.0	97	8
Irish	15.5	94	9
French	9.9	60	10
Polish	16.8	102	7
Russian	51.6	313	2
English/Scottish/Welsh	24.1	146	5
RACIAL MINORITIES	% of adults 25 to 29 years of age		
American Indian/Alaskan Native	8.0	48	11
Black	6.8	42	12
Mexican-American	6.0	36	13
Japanese-American	41.3	248	3
Chinese-American	58.3	352	1
Pilipino-American	29.0	176	4
Puerto Rican	4.3	24	14

* For ethnic groups, these data are for 1971.

For racial minorities, the data were adjusted for 1971.

TABLE 4

RANKING OF SOCIAL STANDING SCORES AND OF INDEX NUMBERS FOR EACH INDICATOR

GROUP	RANKING OF COMPOSITE SOCIAL STANDING SCORE	RANKING OF INDEX OF PER CAPITA INCOME	RANKING OF INDEX OF MALE OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE	RANKING OF INDEX OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACHIEVED
ETHNIC GROUPS				
German	6	6	5.5	6
Italian	7	5	8.5	8
Irish	9	7	7	9
French	10	8.5	8.5	10
Polish	5	3	4	7
Russian	1	1	1	2
English/Scottish/ Welsh	4	4	3	5
RACIAL MINORITIES				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	11	14	12	11
Black	12	11.5	13.5	12
Mexican-American	13	13	13.5	13
Japanese-American	2	2	5.5	3
Chinese-American	3	8.5	2	1
Pilipino-American	8	10	10	4
Puerto Rican	14	11.5	11	14

SPEARMAN'S RANK ORDER CORRELATION

Income and Prestige: $r = +.84$

Income and Education: $r = +.70$

Prestige and Education: $r = +.83$

TABLE 5

PER CAPITA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD AND FAMILY INCOME
1971

GROUP	PER CAPITA MEDIAN INCOME 1971*	INDEX NUMBER TOTAL UNITED STATES = 100	RANKING OF INDEX NUMBER
United States total	$2,960	100	
ETHNIC GROUPS			
German	$3,229	109	6
Italian	$3,425	116	5
Irish	$3,160	107	7
French	$2,935	99	8.5
Polish	$3,583	121	3
Russian	$4,493	152	1
English/Scottish/Welsh	$3,545	120	4
RACIAL MINORITIES			
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	$1,566	53	14
Black	$1,623	55	11.5
Mexican-American	$1,599	54	13
Japanese-American	$4,158	140	2
Chinese-American	$2,922	99	8.5
Pilipino-American	$2,771	94	10
Puerto Rican	$1,626	55	11.5

* For ethnic groups, this is the per capita median household income in 1971.

For racial minorities, this is the per capita median family income adjusted for 1971.

TABLE 6

MALE OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE
1971

GROUP	MALE OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORE*	INDEX NUMBER UNITED STATES TOTAL = 100	RANKING OF INDEX NUMBER
United States total	38.9	100	
ETHNIC GROUPS			
German	40.0	102	5.5
Italian	39.0	100	8.5
Irish	39.1	101	7
French	38.9	100	8.5
Polish	41.2	106	4
Russian	48.2	124	1
English/Scottish/Welsh	41.8	107	3
RACIAL MINORITIES			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	31.3	80	12
Black	29.8	77	13.5
Mexican-American	29.9	77	13.5
Japanese-American	39.7	102	5.5
Chinese-American	41.9	108	2
Pilipino-American	34.3	88	10
Puerto Rican	31.4	81	11

* For ethnic groups, this score was calculated for 1971.

For racial minorities, this score was adjusted for 1971.

FOOTNOTES

1. The author wishes to thank the following people who made valuable contributions to this effort: Dr. Cody Wilson for help in the statistical development of this paper; Dr. Gunther Geiss and staff for computer assistance; Dr. Helen Hacker for extensive critique and suggestions; Mr. Fred Pastor for research assistance; and Ms. Ruth McLoughlin for extensive typing assistance.

   An earlier abbreviated version of this paper was given at the 1979 Annual Meetings of the American Anthropological Association in Cincinnati, Ohio.

2. To get comparable data for the white ethnics and the racial minorities has been difficult. A relatively close approximation for comparability has been made according to the following method. Data on per capita median household income are available for the racial minority groups for the years 1969 and 1975. The difference in this median income was prorated by year over the 6 year period. The estimated adjusted 1971 median per capita household income was used in this study as the income indicator for the racial minorities.

   Data used for the white ethnic groups, for comparison with the racial minorities, were 1971 median family income. Determination of the per capita median family income necessitated dividing the median 1971 total family income for each group by the mean number of persons per family for each ethnic group. These latter data were available for 1972. By dividing the 1972 mean number of people per family into the 1971 median family income, it was possible to arrive at an estimate of median per capita family income for the white ethnic groups for the period 1971-72. It is assumed that no significant difference occurred in the number of people per family between 1971 and 1972. It is likely that the results would have been essentially the same were data on family size available for 1971.

A word must be said about comparing median per capita family income for white ethnics with median per capita household income for minorities. The per capita income figure for the racial minorities is probably somewhat inflated compared to the figure for white ethnics. The median household per capita income (used for minorities) includes both families and households of unrelated persons. Among the latter the numbers of non-earning dependents is small. Hence per capita income in these households is likely to be somewhat larger than in families. The family income figures (used for white ethnics) excludes households of unrelated persons. No attempt has been made to correct for this small non-comparable effect. While data for white ethnics and for racial minorities are roughly comparable, it must be recognized that income figures for minorities are slightly higher compared to the white ethnics than they would have been had data for both groups been exactly comparable.

3. Data for the white ethnics are available as of March 1971. For the racial minorities, data are available for 1970 and 1976. Here again, as for per capita income, the information was prorated, and an estimate for 1971 arrived at. These 1971 estimates for racial minorities were used to compare with the 1971 data available for white ethnics.

   Further, the data for white ethnics indicate the proportion of persons completing college or beyond among young adults 25 to 35 years of age. Data for racial minorities show the proportion among persons 25 to 29 years of age. There was no way to compensate for this difference.

   Again, the data for racial minorities are probably somewhat inflated because of this discrepancy. The proportion of college completions among all groups would likely be higher among those under 30 than among older persons. The trend has been for an increasingly higher proportion of young

people to attend and complete college. The data available for this study place racial minorities somewhat higher on the education indicator, compared to white ethnics, than would likely to be the case were the data exactly comparable.

4. Male occupational prestige scores for minority groups were established by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1978). Again, estimates were made for 1971 to achieve comparability with white ethnic groups.

   Data on 1971 male occupational distribution for white ethnic groups was taken from the Census Bureau (P-20, #249). For each ethnic group the male occupational prestige score was developed using the proportion of males in each occupational category and the appropriate numerical prestige value for that occupational category. (The table of prestige values appears in the United States Commission on Civil Rights publication, 1978).

   The 1971 male occupational prestige scores achieve as close comparability between racial minorities and white ethnic groups as current data allow.

5. It should be pointed out that the mean figures calculated for SSS and for each of the three individual indicators (income, occupation, education) would have been much higher but for the effects of the four lowest racial minorities. (See Table 1) The scores of these four groups are so low compared to the other ten as to depress the mean below the individual scores for nine of the other ten on SSS, on income and on occupational prestige. Only on the education indicator which varies very widely, are there nine groups below the mean rather than above it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramson, Harold J. 1973.
ETHNIC DIVERSITY IN CATHOLIC AMERICA
New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bahr, Howard M., B.A. Chatwick and J.H. Strauss. 1979.
AMERICAN ETHNICITY. Lexington, Massachusetts:
D.C. Heath and Company.

Blau, Peter and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967.
THE AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE.
New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Coleman, Richard and Lee Rainwater. 1978.
SOCIAL STANDING IN AMERICA: NEW DIMENSIONS OF CLASS.
New York: Basic Books, Inc.

_____ and Bernice L. Neugarten. 1971.
SOCIAL STATUS IN THE CITY. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Curtis, Richard F. and Elton F. Jackson. 1971.
INEQUALITY IN AMERICAN COMMUNITIES. New York:
Academic Press.

Dinnerstein, Leonard and David M. Reimers. 1975.
ETHNIC AMERICANS: A HISTORY OF IMMIGRATION AND ASSIMILATION.
New York: Harper and Row.

Goode, William J. 1963.
WORLD REVOLUTION AND FAMILY PATTERNS.
New York: Free Press of Glen Cove.

Gordon, Milton M. 1973.
SOCIAL CLASS IN AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY.
New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1974.
ETHNICITY IN THE UNITED STATES: A PRELIMINARY RECONNAISSANCE.
New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hauser, Robert M. and David L. Featherman. 1977.
THE PROCESS OF STRATIFICATION: TRENDS AND ANALYSES.
New York: Academic Press.

Hollingshead, A.B. and F.C. Redlich. 1950.
SOCIAL CLASS AND MENTAL ILLNESS: A COMMUNITY STUDY.
New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hunt, Chester L. and Lewis Walker. 1974.
ETHNIC DYNAMICS: PATTERNS OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS
IN VARIOUS SOCIETIES. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Jencks, Christopher. 1972.
INEQUALITY. New York: Basic Books.

Jiobu, Robert M. 1976.
"Earning Differentials Between Whites and Ethnic
Minorities: The Cases of Asian Americans, Blacks
and Chicanos." SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH.
61:1, pp. 25-38.

Kaplan, H. Roy. 1977.
AMERICAN MINORITIES AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY.
Itaska, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, Inc.

Kinloch, Graham C. 1979.
THE SOCIOLOGY OF MINORITY GROUP RELATIONS.
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Lenski, G. 1966.
POWER AND PRIVILEGE: A THEORY OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION.
New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lynd, Robert and H. Lynd. 1929.
MIDDLETOWN. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Rothman, Jack. 1977.
ISSUES IN RACE AND ETHNIC RELATIONS: THEORY, RESEARCH
AND ACTION. Itaska, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, Inc.

Sowell, Thomas. 1978.
AMERICAN ETHNIC GROUPS. The Urban Institute.

Treiman, Donald J. 1977.
OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE.
New York: Academic Press.

United States Bureau of the Census. 1973.
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION BY ETHNIC ORIGIN:
MARCH 1972 and 1971. CPR, P-20, No. 249.
Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. 1978.
SOCIAL INDICATORS OF EQUALITY FOR MINORITIES AND WOMEN.
Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
THE MEASURE OF POVERTY, April 1976.

Warner, W. Lloyd. 1945.
YANKEE CITY SERIES. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Willie, Charles Vert. 1979.
THE CASTE AND CLASS CONTROVERSY. New York: General Hall, Inc.

Yetman, Norman R. and C. Hoy Steele, 1975.
MAJORITY AND MINORITY: THE DYNAMICS OF RACIAL AND
ETHNIC RELATIONS. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.